

Appl. No.: 10/689,955
Applicant(s): Mileos et al.
Filed: October 21, 2003

RECEIVED
CENTRAL FAX CENTER

AUG 30 2006

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

In the August 17, 2006 Office Action, the Examiner rejected claims: as indefinite and for double patenting. The Applicants respectfully traverse the Examiner's rejections and submit that any proper basis has been obviated by the present amendments; or that the rejection must be withdrawn.

The Applicants further respectfully submit that the present amendments put the application in better condition for appeal.

Allowable Subject Matter

The Applicants also wish to acknowledge that the Examiner stated that Claims 47, 57 – 64 and 91 are allowed; that “Claims 2-7, 9-24, 26-29 and 32-46 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form . . .;” and that “Claims 85 and 94 would be allowable if rewritten” if rewritten or amended to overcome the section 112, second paragraph rejections and continue to contain all of the limitations of their respective base claim(s). In view of the present amendments, the Applicants respectfully submit that these claims are in condition for allowance.

Support for the Present Amendments

The present amendment amends Claim 23 to conform to the canceling of Claim 22, from which Claim 23 previously depended.

The present amendment amends Claim 25 to conform to the Examiner's request for clarification and does not change the scope of this claim.

Appl. No.: 10/689,955
Applicant(s): Mileos et al.
Filed: October 21, 2003

The present amendment amends Claim 30 to incorporate the limitation formerly presented in Claim 22.

The present amendment amends Claim 47 to conform to the Examiner's request for clarification and does not change the scope of this claim.

The present amendment amends Claim 85 to recite the same terms as were used in the base claim so as to clarify the antecedent basis for the several terms.

The present amendment amends Claim 94 to recite the same term as was used in the base claim so as to clarify the antecedent basis for the term identified by the Examiner as lacking an antecedent basis.

The present amendment amends Claim 101 to incorporate the limitation formerly presented in Claim 22.

The present amendment amends Claim 102 to incorporate the limitation formerly presented in Claim 22.

New Claim 103 presents the subject matter of former Claim 101 plus the subject matter of former Claim 2.

New Claim 104 presents the subject matter of former Claim 102 plus the subject matter of former Claim 2.

New Claim 105 presents the subject matter of former Claim 30 plus the subject matter of former Claim 2.

THE REJECTIONS

The Examiner rejected Claims 30, 101 and 102 as claiming the same invention as that of claims 7, 10 and 8 of the Applicants' prior U.S. Patent No. 5,924,664.

Appl. No.: 10/689,955
Applicant(s): Mileos et al.
Filed: October 21, 2003

The Applicants have now amended Claims 30, 101 and 102 to recite the means for rotating limitation formerly found in Claim 22. As the Examiner found that Claim 22 would be allowable if it was amended to be in independent form, the Applicants respectfully submit that this amendment obviates the double patenting rejection of Claims 30, 101 and 102.

The Examiner also rejected claim 25 as being an obviousness variant of the subject matter claimed in the Applicants prior patent. To obviate this rejection, the Applicants have included with this response a Terminal Disclaimer.

Additionally, the Examiner rejected claims 85 and 94 as indefinite because of a lack of antecedent basis for several terms used in these claims. To obviate the bases for this rejection, the Applicants amended these claims to use the same terminology as was used in the corresponding base claims.

CONCLUSION

In view of the above amendments and remarks, the Applicants respectfully submit that they have obviated any reasonable basis for any of the rejections set forth in the Office Action of August 17, 2006. The Applicants therefore respectfully submit that the pending claims are in condition for allowance and respectfully solicit the same at an early date.

It is not believed that extensions of time or fees for net addition of claims are required, beyond those that may otherwise be provided for in documents accompanying this paper. However, in the event that additional extensions of time are necessary to allow consideration of this paper, such extensions are hereby petitioned under 37 CFR


Appl. No.: 10/689,955
Applicant(s): Mileos et al.
Filed: October 21, 2003

RECEIVED
CENTRAL FAX CENTER
AUG 30 2006

§ 1.136(a), and any fee required therefore (including fees for net addition of claims) is
hereby authorized to be charged to Deposit Account No. 16-0605.

The Examiner is invited to call the undersigned if there are any questions.


Respectfully submitted,


Walter Scott
Registration No. 30,588

Customer No. 00826
ALSTON & BIRD LLP
Bank of America Plaza
101 South Tryon Street, Suite 4000
Charlotte, NC 28280-4000
Tel New York Office (212) 210-9518
Fax Charlotte Office (704) 444-1111

CERTIFICATION OF FACSIMILE TRANSMISSION

I hereby certify that this paper is being facsimile transmitted to the US Patent and Trademark Office at Fax No. 571-273-8300, on the date shown below.



August 30, 2006
Date